UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/403,072	01/19/2000	RONNY KNEPPLE	3143-P0082A	6808

7590 07/19/2002

WESLEY W WHITMYER JR
ST ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 069055619

EXAMINER
LEE, DIANE I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/403,072	KNEPPLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diane I. Lee	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2 and 5-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2 and 5-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 22 April 2002. Claims 1, 3, 4 have been canceled; claims 2, 5-9 have been amended; and claims 10-13 have been newly added. Currently, claims 2 and 5-13 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 10: Lines 2+ read, *"providing a container for holding a sample to be analyzed; elevating a temperature of the container above a sample analysis temperature"*. Applicant has not clearly point out the type of the analysis and the sample analysis temperature. It is vague and unclear to define the elevated temperature range that is above the undefined sample analysis temperature. The sample analysis temperature is directly depending on the type of the analysis and/or the characteristics of the sample. For example, a sample analysis temperature for a visual analysis or an identification analysis would be a room temperature. Therefore, without clearly defining the analysis type of the sample, the limitation vague and indefinite. For examination purpose, the examiner has defined the sample analysis temperature as a room temperature.

Therefore, claim 10 and claims depend therefrom, claims 2, 5-9, 11-13, are vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 5-6 and 9-13 (as best understood) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ono [JP 05-000,821 A].

Re claims 5 and 10-13: Ono discloses a method for labeling sample containers (bottle 1), comprising the steps of:

providing a container for holding a sample to be analyzed and wherein the analysis includes a container and/or sample identification by an analysis device (i.e., reading device 11 for an identification and classification). Therefore, the sample container operating temperature (e.g., an identification operation) would be a room temperature; and

applying container identification (bar code 6) to the container at the elevated temperature above a sample analysis temperature or a room temperature (i.e., in the manufacturing process of the sample container, the bottle material is blown to form a bottle 1. The bottle is blown during the "hot end" of the bottle manufacturing process and wherein the temperature range of the hot end would be at a maximum. During the final cooling phase of the ready sample container, heater 2, 3 is utilized to form an identification such as a bar code 6 on the container, which clearly teaches that the temperature of the container when applying the bar code to the container is at the elevated temperature above the sample analysis temperature (i.e., applying the bar code at least higher than the room temperature)). Since a maximum temperature would be provided at the hot end of the bottle manufacturing process, the identification is clearly applied in a temperature interval between a maximum temperature and a temperature that is above the operating or the room temperature (see the abstract). Therefore, Ono clearly

teaches the process of elevating a temperature of the container above a sample analysis temperature and applying a bar code to the container at the elevated temperature that is above the room temperature.

Re claims 6 and 9: wherein the identification is applied in the form of a symbol such as a bar code applied annually onto a cylindrical portion of the sample container such that the bar code 6 is readable along the cylindrical axis (see the abstract and figures 3-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono. The teachings of Ono have been discussed above.

Re claim 2: Although Ono teaches the temperature of the heater is adjusted by a temperature controller 5, Ono is silent with respect to specifically controlling the temperature interval, i.e., between 300°C and 600°C.

However, it would have been an obvious variation to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the temperature in order to provide specific desire strength of the container. Varying temperature of the bottle material would alter the strength characteristic and the formation of the bottle. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious extension taught by Ono.

Re claim 7: Ono does not disclose the identification is applied along with numerals and/or letters.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the numerals and/or letters in the optical identification process of Ono to expand the identification labeling technique. Furthermore, applying the identification with numerals and/or letters in an optical reading process (incorporating optical character reading in the bar code reading) would have been an obvious extension taught by Ono for the purpose of providing additional information. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious expedient.

Re claim 8: Ono does not disclose the identification is applied in form of numerals and/or letters.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the bar code reading process of Ono with an optical reading process by providing the identification code in form of numerals and/or letters in order to eliminate the computing process in the decoder. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 22 April 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 5, lines 20+, applicant argues that Ono does not disclose, teach, or suggest elevating a container temperature above a sample analysis temperature nor, at the elevated temperature, applying container identification to the container, and further stated that Ono never mention any temperature for any sample analysis and, therefore, does not disclose elevating a container temperature above, and relative to, the sample analysis temperature. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Due to the fact that applicant has not

clearly defined the analysis type, the examiner has given a broadest interpretation of the claim and defined the operating temperature as a room temperature (see the discussion in paragraphs 8-11 above). The sample analysis temperature is directly depend on the type of the analysis and/or the characteristics of the sample. For example, a sample analysis temperature for a visual analysis or an identification analysis would be a room temperature. Therefore, without clearly defining the analysis type, Ono anticipates the claimed limitation, i.e., Ono teaches the process of elevating a container temperature above a sample analysis temperature (i.e., in the manufacturing process of the sample container, the bottle material is blown to form a bottle 1. The bottle is blown during the "hot end" of the bottle manufacturing process and wherein the temperature range of the hot end would be at a maximum. During the final cooling phase of the ready sample container, heater is utilized to form an identification such as a bar code 6 on the container which clearly teaches that the temperature of the container is at the elevated temperature above the temperature of the sample analysis temperature or the room temperature). Therefore, the bar code is clearly applied in a temperature above the operating or identification temperature (i.e., a room temperature). Furthermore, Ono clearly teaches the temperature (i.e., the temperature interval between a maximum and an operating temperature) for sample analysis wherein the analysis includes an identification process. Therefore, Ono clearly teaches the process of elevating a container temperature above the sample analysis temperature.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Siddiqui [US 5,939,468] and Viktor [DE 37 32 245 A1] discloses a method of labeling a container.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane I. Lee whose telephone number is 703-306-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

/Diane Lee/

Diane I. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

July 8, 2002